



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the field of politics; and the most productive reconstruction in mental test theory and technique will be one that serves to increase the contribution of mental testing as descriptive science.

BEARDSLEY RUML.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION.

THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

THE twenty-ninth annual meeting of the American Psychological Association marked an unusually well attended and enthusiastic gathering of American students of psychology. Because of Chicago's central location and probably because of the fact that the American Association for the Advancement of Science also held its meetings in the midwest metropolis, the registration was unusually large. It would be rash of course to attempt to correlate the fresh and eager attitude of the assembled psychologists with the proverbial breezes of Chicago, but possibly there is some relation between the enthusiasm of the psychologists and the remedial effects of time upon the disturbances of war. The calmer consideration of problems scientific and pedagogic gave ample evidence of our passing on from war time events. In truth, the various discussions during the several sessions manifested stronger currents of psychological and general scientific interest than has been the case in the past few years.

The session began on Tuesday morning, December 28, and ended the Thursday morning following. At times the meetings were rather bewildering, since, because of the combined sessions with sections I and sometimes Q of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, there were as many as four sessions at once. All meetings were held in the Law Building of the University of Chicago. The meetings were announced in the programmes as follows: Tuesday morning a session for general psychology; in the afternoon of the same day two sessions were scheduled, one in experimental psychology paralleling a joint session with sections I and Q of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Wednesday afternoon there was scheduled the address of Dr. Yerkes, the retiring vice-president of section I which was articulated with the psychological association meeting, advertised as a session for social psychology. Dr. Yerkes spoke on "The Relation of Psychology to Medicine," and advocated the establishment of psychology in the medical curriculum as a basic medical science.

On Wednesday afternoon the session on social psychology was followed by the business meeting. In the evening the annual dinner

of the American Psychological Association was held in Ida Noyes Hall, the palatial women's social center building of the University of Chicago. Following the dinner, the president of the Association, Dr. Shepherd Ivory Franz, delivered an excellent and important address, and later in the evening a period was devoted to some reminiscences of Wilhelm Wundt by Messrs. Cattell, Judd, Scott, and Pintner.

The programme for Thursday morning announced a session for comparative psychology. In addition to these meetings announced on the American Psychological Association programme, the American Association for the Advancement of Science programme scheduled a joint meeting of section I (psychology) and Q (education) for Tuesday morning, and a "Symposium on Problems of Psychology" for Thursday morning. The psychologists who spoke at the symposium and the titles of their papers were: Dr. Cattell, "Practical Psychology;" President Scott, "Psychology in Industry;" Professor Judd, "Problems in Psychology;" Dr. Yerkes, "Problems of Psychology."

In commenting upon the meetings it is necessary to distinguish between the session headings of the programme and the contents of the papers read. For the two things, namely, the session headings and the contents of the papers did not always agree. Thus, the session announced for comparative psychology listed only two papers out of a total of six, which were reports on animals. Also, out of seven papers listed under industrial psychology and tests, only two were industrial in nature. To these two papers may be added a third on advertising media, strangely appearing under the heading of comparative psychology; these three constituted the total number of papers on industrial and commercial topics. As no doubt there is a definite correlation between the interests and occupations of American psychologists and the content of the papers read at this meeting, it is interesting to enumerate the papers by topic. Tests and guidance, 22 papers, plus 7 in the psychological section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; experimental psychology, 19 papers, 8 of which were on learning, 2 on auditory phenomena, 5 on oculo-visual investigations and the rest on scattered topics; general psychology, 7 papers; social psychology 3; and animal psychology 2.

Judging from the association meeting, it is not incorrect to say that American psychologists are for the most part tremendously interested in tests of various sorts, although there are numerous indications of serious dissatisfaction with much of the testing work done. How decided is the disapproval of much of the test work could be gathered from the remarks of Professor Judd, who spoke in the

symposium of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Professor Judd uttered a definite warning against much of the work in tests, making many references to dangers to psychology as a science. The theme of his remarks was that the persons working with tests are not careful enough to provide themselves with a basic scientific psychological foundation. Unfortunately Professor Judd made no specific recommendation as to what constitutes a scientific foundation for testing work, although as a general proposition his argument seemed decisive and compelling. The general impression gathered from his remarks seemed to be that he was referring to a more intense acquaintance with the principles and technique of experimental psychology, presumably in the sense of physiological psychology. This opinion was expressed by the speaker in the form of an assertion to the effect that mental testers were not giving enough attention to fundamental explanatory phases of psychological science. Now although there are few who would disagree with Professor Judd, as to his general thesis, the psychologists interested in mental test work can not apparently find any very close relation between the introspective experimental psychology and their particular problems.

Psychologists in general will be more than pleased, however, to observe the growing sentiment against the unchecked development of uncritical testing work. Dr. Yerkes, who spoke after Professor Judd in the symposium, was very positive in his remarks concerning the necessity for a critical analysis of mental testing. Dr. Yerkes referred to the fact that many testers were not psychologists at all, and were unfamiliar with psychological principles. As evidence of the precariousness of much of the testing work we might refer to the uncritical handling of such concepts as *superior* and *inferior* as applied to races in the papers on the comparative testing of American white and other subjects. The unscientific and probably unknown bias concerning the superiority of one's own race is responsible for much innocent shifting of emphasis, even when the reporter's own data are unequivocal in discouraging conclusions of superiority and inferiority.

Professor Dodge, who opened the discussion, following the presentation of the symposium papers, apparently stimulated by a suggestion made at another session that we substitute more Freudian material for the physiological psychology, made an impassioned plea for the conservation of the old materials in psychology. He connected this point with the problem of mental testing, in that he considered physiological psychology as a valuable basis for any application of psychology. From a strictly scientific standpoint the

problem of providing a critical explanatory basis for mental testing and other psychological application is not that of abiding by any tradition, as Professor Dodge's plea may be superficially interpreted, but rather to base psychological applications upon verified psychological hypotheses. And so it is significant to observe that the active work in experimental psychology is either concerned with problems in learning or with more definite determinations of the physical stimulating conditions of the person performing visual or auditory actions.

After listening to the various discussions at the several sessions, one is severely impressed by the fact that comparatively few psychologists are interested in bringing to the surface the theoretical implications of their experimental work. Thus, for example, it was possible for Professor Dodge to make his plea for traditional psychology, although his own experimental work has been for the most part directed toward achieving a better control over stimulating conditions to the end that an exact correlation could be made between such stimulating conditions and the reactions to them, and thus is not traditional at all. In other words, Professor Dodge does not take account of the differences between his own objective methods and the less valuable introspectionism. To the writer it seems that much of the difference between those who knowingly adhere to an objectivistic position and most of those who work in sensory experimental psychology, is that the former do, while the latter do not make plain to themselves that they are not working merely with manifestations, but that their data *are* the correlations which they record between definite forms of reactions and specific stimuli. This fact comes out clearly when we observe that, although the experimentalist does actually correlate stimuli and responses, he thinks of himself as studying something with which he is not dealing directly, namely, consciousness, and so the learning as well as the sensory experimentalists still believe that they must offer neural explanations for their results, although it seems a far cry from the actual learning act to a hypothetical synaptic connection. It is but natural, of course, that the nervous system should serve as the tangible parallel and representative of the invisible and elusive consciousness.

That psychologists in general are not very much interested in so-called theoretical problems is attested by the fact that little discussion followed the reading of the papers in the general session. The practical temper of the psychologists present was markedly evident since it required the stimulus of Dr. Cattell's remarks on the statistical treatment of data, in his paper on the "Validity of Votes," to invoke any comment at all. This paper, and Professor Thurston's paper on "What Should Be Taught in the Introductory Course," were the

only ones of the general session that aroused the assembled psychologists to expressive activity. Thurston's suggestion to introduce the beginning student to some phases of human behavior aside from the simple sensory reactions met with quite violent opposition. The comment following Thurston's paper indicated quite clearly that whatever may be the condition in our institutions concerning the gathering and testing of scientific information the work of teaching will be very well guarded indeed. Are American psychologists not interested in the development of new attitudes and in the interpretative correlation of psychological facts gathered in the various domains of observation? Possibly our teachers are merely depending upon the workers in other countries to initiate problems and to develop fundamental principles, for it is impossible to believe otherwise than that without such work there would soon be nothing to teach so far as principles are concerned. And who would be so imprudent as to deny the connection between psychological principles and the techniques which make it possible for us to have facts at all?

And yet the lack of interest in theoretical problems does not signify any profound absorption in experimental psychology. This fact appeared evident from the scanty attendance upon the experimental sessions, whereas the test meetings were crowded. The vogue of the metal-instrument psychology is not flourishing and for the reason that it is generally appreciated that even with metal instruments we are unable to obtain data concerning processes which are invisible and intangible. That is to say, psychologists are apparently unwilling to go on with the old problems set by the epistemological physiologists of a half century ago. But on the other hand, the lull in the development of experimental psychology is due no doubt to the failure to appreciate generally that the newer problems involving responses to stimuli can be advantageously cultivated with the aid of laboratory equipment. For by means of instruments we can certainly refine our observations of stimulating conditions and the reactions of the person. For the advantage of psychology we must note that complaint can only be made against the old parallelistic experimentation, and in truth there is to-day far too little work done in the psychological laboratory, although obviously human psychology must be largely a field science.

An irony of science it is, as we have formerly implied, that the very psychologists who hint at the lack of interest in experimental psychology, by referring to the lure of the spectacular and the attractiveness of popular applause, such as are met with by the tester and those who in general apply psychology, are themselves responsible for the backwardness of fundamental psychological experimentation. As we have indicated above, the failure to appreciate overtly

that experimental psychology is now working in the service of objective science and not still searching for a soul, and the neglect to proclaim this fact, is to the largest extent responsible for the failure of development in the experimental field. Signalized in this failure by the fact that laboratory work in psychology is quite strictly confined to the physiological sort and seldom includes a problem in the so-called higher mental processes. Although there must be great temptation in popular applause, it is only fair to say that psychologists desert the laboratory problems in order to turn to testing work, mainly because test statistics appear definite and certain. Unfortunately, however, the statistical statements are sometimes mistaken for actual psychological phenomena.

Of especial interest is it to note that the prevailing tone among psychologists who do discuss principles is objective, and the prevailing tendency is to couch discussion in psychobiological terms. Although there was visible in several papers an attempt to set one's own introspectionism against the behaviorism of others and *vice versa*, still there was so much reinterpretation of fact and principle as to allow more than a casual coming together upon the same ground. Especially noticeable was this tendency in a paper by Professor E. G. Boring on the "Common-Sense of the Stimulus-Error." This writer, while aligning himself with the introspectionists, made such an analysis of the facts of the cutaneous limen of duality, as to make his position practically indistinguishable from that of another writer, calling himself an objectivist. Professor Boring's analysis was directed against both the extreme introspectionists and the extreme behaviorists, in that it brought to light both the stimulus and the various stages in the response-situation. When such an analysis is made the difference in positions vanishes completely, although the names of the factors in a stimulus-response situation vary at the hands of the different writers. Here lies the value of actively attending to one's psychological principles, for not only does such an inventory lead to an understanding between different workers, but it also paves the way for much needed co-operation.

The keynote to current psychological thought and observation, as it appears to the writer, was sounded in Dr. Franz's presidential address. Dr. Franz entitled his paper "Cerebral-Mental Parallelism," and planned in it to indicate the uselessness of such a problem in psychological work. Dr. Franz's paper was the report of some cases which appeared rather definitely to indicate the lack of dependence of mental activity upon specific cortical centers, although of course there is a general correlation of such activity with the

cortex. The substance of the address may be summed up in two propositions. (1) The destruction of cortical tissue need not necessarily result in a destruction of mental activity. Individuals whose defective brains were studied after death had previously reported no loss of imagery. And (2) even when cortical lesions are correlated with mental disturbances the subject may experience a restoration of mental function without improvement of the cortical tissue. Dr. Franz believes that mental activity consists of a series of habits which the individual acquires. Now when some of these habits are destroyed or impaired they may be reconstituted, although the cortical lesions may remain. It is not difficult to see how this can occur, if we remember that an act can be constituted of various kinds of individual sensori-motor coordinations. In one case quoted by the speaker a surprising amount of cortical tissue was deteriorated in a person who for several years before death had enjoyed a renewal of much of his mental and intellectual activities. In the conclusion of his address Dr. Franz strongly urged the psychologists present to look favorably upon researches in physiological and neural psychology, since after all the facts seemed to indicate that psychological reactions involved the total operation of the person. To the writer it seemed that no psychologist who heard the address could fail to be impressed with the importance of its contents for the psycho-physiological problem. With the study and description of more cases such as were presented in Dr. Franz's paper and with the substantiation of Dr. Franz's results there must come a general acceptance of the unitary character of the psychological reaction, and a greater appreciation of the place of the nervous centers as coordinate members among a larger series of factors constituting a reaction. Dr. Franz's paper shows the way to a confirmation of the objective viewpoint in psychology and a revival of investigation in the fundamental principles of psychology. It certainly indicates the way to a study of the reflex and general sensorial processes from another standpoint than that of the old introspective psychology.

As a most fitting memorial to the late master-spirit of psychology, Wilhelm Wundt, the president of the association, called upon several members who had had contact with Professor Wundt, to speak of his life and work. Appropriately enough President Franz first called upon Dr. Cattell, who was an assistant in Wundt's laboratory and who is himself a brilliant figure in the annals of American psychology. Dr. Cattell spoke briefly of Wundt's personal life and then gave a very impressive picture of the profound and far reaching scholar. Professors Judd and Pintner spoke mainly of the man and teacher, emphasizing the humbleness and kindness of one of the world's foremost scientists when dealing with his students. Presi-

dent Scott of Northwestern spoke impressively of the prolonged interests which Wundt maintained in any subject in which he was interested at all. Thus he pointed out how Wundt continued to revise his early works until they reached as many as six editions. It was this prolonged and vital interest in whatever he undertook that Dr. Scott suggested as the factor which above all made for the greatness of the man. A number of the reminiscences clearly indicated the long contact which Professor Wundt maintained with the development of psychology as a science. Especially was this fact brought out by Dr. Cattell's statement that in his early contact with Wundt the latter was of the opinion that psychological experiments could only be performed with trained psychologists. Genuinely instructive was the reference made by one of the speakers to the wide range of Wundt's interests. Mention was made of his ponderous works in logic and ethics, which indeed emphasizes the contrast in scope of interest among scholars which academic custom dictates in our country and in Europe.

At the business meeting held on Wednesday afternoon the election was announced of Professor Margaret Floy Washburn, of Vassar College, as president of the American Psychological Association for the year 1921. Professor W. S. Hunter, of the University of Kansas, and Professor G. F. Arps, of Ohio State University, were elected to the council of the association. The association nominated Professor W. B. Pillsbury, of the University of Michigan, and Professor G. M. Stratton, of the University of California, to represent the Association in the National Research Council, while Professor E. K. Strong, Jr., of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, is to represent the American Psychological Association in the council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. As officers for section I of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the election was announced of Professor E. A. Bott, of Toronto University, as Vice-president; Professor F. N. Freeman, of the University of Chicago, as Secretary, and Professor L. W. Cole, of the University of Colorado, as chairman of the section committee. The Association elected 35 new members, increasing the membership to 428.

Incomplete is a record of the twenty-ninth meeting of the American Psychological Association without recording the names of two distinguished visitors at the sessions, one, the newly inducted successor of James and Münsterberg in Harvard's department of psychology, Professor William McDougall, who was welcomed to membership in the association, and the other, Professor G. A. Jaederholm, of Sweden.

J. R. KANTOR.